UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,507	10/10/2006	German Spangenberg	FREE.P-006	4691
57381 Larson & Ande	7590 09/22/201 rson, LLC	0	EXAM	IINER
P.O. BOX 4928 DILLON, CO 8	}	PAK, YONG D		
DILLON, CO 8	0433		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1652	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/22/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/553,507	SPANGENBERG	ET AL.
Examiner initiated interview cultimary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	YONG D. PAK	1652	
All Participants:	Status of Application:		
(1) <u>YONG D. PAK</u> .	(3)		
(2) <u>Marina Larson</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: 20 September 2010	Time: <u>2:15 pm</u>		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
Claims discussed:			
30, 33 and 35			
Prior art documents discussed:			
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summar 	e examiner will provide a writter record of the substance of the	en summary of the interview, since	ne substance
/Yong D Pak/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1652 (A	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if a	appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In response to the After Final amendment filed on September 13, 2010, Examiner proposed allowing claim 30 and amending the phrase "wherein said functionally active variants have the ability to modify malate dehydrogenase activity in a plant" to "wherein said functioanly active variants have malate dehydrogenase activity" in claims 30 and 35. However, Ms. Larson disagreed because the polynucleotide of (b) and (c) do not encode malate dehydrogenases. (Examiner notes that because amendment of said phrase could not be agreed upon, amendment of other claims was not discussed). Examiner proposed amending "functionally active variants" with the above proposed amendment to only the polynucleotide of (a) since variants of the polynucleotides of (b) or (c) as currently written in the After Final amendment would warrant new rejections. However, Ms. Larson disagreed. Therefore, Examiner noted that an Advisory Action would be mailed in response to the After Final amendment for recitation of the above "functionally active" variants. Ms. Larson argued that said new limitation would not necessitate a new ground of rejection(s) and would file an Appeal.